APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,586	06/25/2003	Qi Xu	1436/154	4870

2101   7590   12/12/2007
BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 SUMMER STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER
DUFFIELD, JEREMY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 June 2003</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 June 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>17 December 2003</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of prior-filed applications under 35 U.S.C 120 is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, 07/589205, fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, and 26 of this application. In particular, limitations referring to "source identifier," "order identifier," "MPEG," "video conferencing," "packet order," "real time protocol," "charged coupled device," "YUV," "RTP," "action identifier," "interrupt," "set-top box identifier," "destination address," and "origination information" are not supported for claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, and 26 in view of the 07/589205 application.

Support for claims 5 and 21 is found in the 07/754932 non-provisional application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, and 26 are not supported, as in the prior-filed application, 07/754932, does not provide adequate support for limitations referring to "source identifier," "order identifier," "MPEG," "packet order," "real time protocol," "charged coupled device," "YUV," "RTP," "action identifier," "interrupt," "set-top box identifier," "destination address," or "origination information".

Support for claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 11, 15, 23, 24, and 26, and in particular, limitations referring to "source identifier," "set-top box identifier," "origination information," "YUV" and "MPEG" is found in the 08/056958 non-provisional application.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, and 25 are not supported, as in the prior-filed applications, 08/056958, 08/318982, 08/660659, and 09/475719, do not provide adequate support for limitations referring to "order identifier," "packet order," "real time protocol," "charged coupled device," "RTP," "action identifier," "interrupt," or "destination address".

Support for claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, and 25and in particular, limitations referring to "order identifier," "packet order," "real time protocol header," "charged coupled device," "RTP," "action identifier," "interrupt," and "destination address" is found in the 60/391298 provisional application.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 shall be examined upon a priority date of 25 June 2002.

Claim 26 shall be examined based upon a priority date of 03 May 1993.

Claims 5, 6, 21, and 22 shall be examined based upon a priority date of 10 September 1991.

Claims 14, 18, 19, 20, and 28 shall be examined based upon a priority date of 27 September 1990 from prior-filed application, 07/589205.

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 13, "set-top

box." needs to be changed to --set-top box;-- and Line 7, "cable television, the" needs to

be changed to --cable television network, the--. Appropriate correction is required.

2.   Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: It appears claim

13 should be dependent on claim 12. Accordingly, Examiner will consider claim 13 as

dependent on claim 12. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-3, 7, 14, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kassatly (US 5,157,491) in view of Stifle (US 4,633,462).

        Regarding claim 1, Kassatly teaches an apparatus for transmitting

multimedia data to a set-top box, i.e. Scanner-Transmitter transmits to a Selector

Receiver (Fig. 8, el. 202, 204), the apparatus comprising:

        means for inputting a signal containing multimedia data, i.e. camera (Fig.

16, el. 300-1, 300-2, 300-3, 300-4);

means for compressing the multimedia data (Col. 13, lines 60-65; Fig. 8, el. 216, 218, 220);

means for packetizing compressed multimedia data (Col. 10, lines 54-58);

means for outputting the packetized multimedia data to a data port of a set-top box, i.e. after multiplexing sending data to receiver in successive packets (Col. 10, lines 54-60; Fig. 8, 204); and

further comprising capture means for capturing the input signal containing multimedia data, i.e. sampling signals (Col. 13, lines 58-68; Fig. 8, el. 206, 208, 210).

Kassatly does not clearly teach an apparatus for distributing data from a set-top box to a headend of a cable television, the apparatus comprising: means for packetizing data with a header including at least a source identifier and an order identifier.

Stifle teaches an apparatus for distributing data from a set-top box, i.e. subscriber decoder unit, to a headend of a cable television (Col. 8, lines 17-28), the apparatus comprising:

means for packetizing data with a header including at least a source identifier, i.e. subscriber address, and an order identifier, i.e. continuity index/packet number (Col. 8, lines 52-67; Col. 9, lines 45-60);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Kassatly's broadcasting system to distribute packetized multimedia data to Stifle's subscriber decoder unit for

distribution to a headend of a cable television network and to modify Kassatly's

packetizing multimedia data process to include adding a header with a subscriber

address and a packet number from Stifle's packetizing process so to enable data

loss detection and origination information from a set-top box to headend in a

video teleconferencing system.

Regarding claim 2, Kassatly (Fig. 8, el. 206, 208, 210; Col. 13, lines 58-

68) in view of Stifle teaches the capture means is an analog to digital converter.

Regarding claim 3, Kassatly (Fig. 8, el. 206, 208, 210; Col. 13, lines 58-

68) in view of Stifle teaches the capture means changes the format of the signal,

i.e. signal sampling, analog signal to digital signal.

Regarding claim 7, Kassatly teaches an apparatus for receiving a

multimedia data signal, and transmitting a compressed digital signal to a set-top

box of a cable television network, i.e. scanner-transmitter transmits channel to be

viewed on a real-time basis (Fig. 8, el. 204; Col. 14, lines 5-7; Col. 12, lines 54-

58), the apparatus comprising:

an input for receiving the multimedia data signal, i.e. multimedia data

signal transmits from a camera to the comparator system and then to the

scanner-transmitter (Col. 15, lines 35-42; Fig. 17, Fig. 8, el. 204);

a capture module for formatting the multimedia data signal creating a

formatted digital signal (Fig. 8, el. 206, 208, 210; Col. 13, lines 58-68);

an encoder for compressing the formatted digital signal creating a

compressed digital signal (Fig. 8, el. 216, 218, 220; Col. 13, lines 58-68);

a packetization module for packetizing the compressed digital signal (Col.

10, lines 54-58); and

an output capable of being operably coupled to the set-top box (Col. 14,

lines 5-7).

Kassatly does not clearly teach a packetization module for including a

header identifying packet order and source; or an output capable of being

operably coupled to the set-top box for transmitting the packets to a headend of

the cable television network.

Stifle teaches a packetization module for including a header identifying

packet order, i.e. continuity index/packet number, and source, i.e. subscriber

address (Col. 8, lines 5-13; Col. 9, lines 45-60); and

an output capable of being operably coupled to the set-top box, i.e.

subscriber decoder unit, for transmitting the packets to a headend of the cable

television network (Col. 8, lines 17-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to use Kassatly's broadcasting system to

distribute packetized multimedia data to Stifle's subscriber decoder unit for

distribution to a headend of a cable television network and to modify Kassatly's

packetizing multimedia data process to include adding a header with a subscriber

address and a packet number from Stifle's packetizing process so to enable data

loss detection and origination information from a set-top box to headend in a

video teleconferencing system.

Regarding claim 14, Kassatly teaches a system for multimedia

transmission of data in a cable television network (Fig. 8, el. 204; Col. 12, lines

54-58), the system for multimedia transmission comprising:

a multimedia device, i.e. Scanner-Transmitter (Fig. 8, el. 204); and

a set-top box, i.e. Selector-Receiver (Fig. 8, el. 202), wherein the

multimedia device has an input port for receiving a multimedia signal, i.e. from

camera through comparator system to Scanner-Transmitter (Col. 15, lines 38-41;

Col. 16, lines 7-10; Fig. 17), and an output port, i.e. from Scanner-Transmitter to

Selector-Receiver (Fig. 8, el. 202, 204), for sending to the set-top box a

packetized compressed digital representation of the multimedia signal, (Fig. 8, el.

216, 218, 220; Col. 13, lines 58-68; Col. 10, lines 54-58);

wherein the set-top box receives the packetized compressed digital

representation of the multimedia signal (Fig. 8, el. 202, 204; Col. 14, lines 5-7).

Kassatly does not clearly teach the set-top box forwards the multimedia

signal to a headend of the cable television network.

Stifle teaches a set-top box, i.e. subscriber decoder unit, forwards a

multimedia signal to a headend of a cable television network (Col. 8, lines 17-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Kassatly's broadcasting system to distribute packetized multimedia data to Stifle's subscriber decoder unit for distribution to a headend of a cable television network so to enable the use of an existing CATV network instead of implementing a new network which could be costly.

Regarding claim 27, Kassatly in view of Stifle (Col. 8, lines 5-13; Col. 9, lines 45-60) teaches the packetization module includes a header to each packet which does not include a destination address.

Regarding claim 28, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches the multimedia device packetizes the multimedia signal (Kassatly-Col. 10, 49-59) wherein the header information does not include a destination address (Stifle- Col. 8, lines 5-13; Col. 9, lines 45-60).

5.   Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kassatly in view of Stifle and further in view of Siracusa (US 5,289,276).

Regarding claim 4, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of claim 1.

Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the means for compression performs MPEG encoding.

Siracusa teaches the means for compression performs MPEG encoding

(Col. 2, lines 31-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to use MPEG

encoding for the compression process for the purpose of having standardized

encoding/decoding and allowing the use of any compatible device that uses

MPEG packets.

Regarding claim 11, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of

claim 7.

Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the encoder employs

MPEG compression algorithms.

Siracusa teaches an encoder that employs MPEG compression algorithms

(Col. 2, lines 31-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to use MPEG

encoding for the compression process for the purpose of having standardized

encoding/decoding and allowing the use of any compatible device that uses

MPEG packets.

6.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Tompkins

(US 4,686,698) in view of Stifle.

Regarding claim 5, Tompkins teaches an apparatus for facilitating video conferencing for use with a cable television network, (Col. 2, lines 52-55; Col. 23, lines 60-64), i.e. video conferencing information transmitted/received to/from the "Mate" or Multimedia Terminal Equipment through the "Mix" or the Multimedia Information Exchange to/from the CATV network, the apparatus comprising:

an input for receiving a signal having multimedia data (Fig. 1, el. 10, 26);

a demodulator for demodulating the signal (Col. 6, lines 64-68);

an analog to digital converter for digitizing the multimedia data (Col. 24, lines 55-59);

an output module for facilitating the transport of the digitized multimedia data (Col. 6, line 58-Col. 7, line 2).

Tompkins does not clearly teach a cable television network having a headend or the transporting of data to a headend.

Stifle teaches a cable television network having a headend and the transporting of data to a headend (Col. 8, lines 17-29; Fig. 1, el. 10, 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tompkins to use a cable television network having a headend and to have an output module for facilitating the transport of digitized multimedia data to the headend so to enable the use of an existing network instead of implementing a new network which would be costly.

7.   Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by

Tompkins (US 4,686,698) in view of Stifle and further in view of Kassatly.

        Regarding claim 6, Tompkins in view of Stifle teaches all elements of

claim 5.

        Tompkins in view of Stifle does not clearly teach an encoder operably

coupled to the output module for compressing the digitized multimedia data prior

to receipt by the headend.

        Kassatly teaches an encoder operably coupled to the output module for

compressing the digitized multimedia data (Fig. 8, el. 202, 204; Col. 14, lines 5-

7).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Tompkins in view of Stifle to have an

encoder operably coupled to the output module for compressing the digitized

multimedia data, as taught by Kassatly, prior to receipt by Stifle's headend so to

enable the efficient transmission of more data in each packet.

        Regarding claim 26, Tompkins in view of Stifle (Col. 8, lines 5-13; Col. 9,

lines 45-58) in view of Kassatly (Fig. 8, el. 202, 204; Col. 14, lines 5-7) teaches a

packetizer which creates packets from the compressed digitized multimedia data,

wherein the packets do not provide a destination address and include origination

information, i.e. subscriber address.

8.   Claims 8, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kassatly in view of Stifle and further in view of Jorgensen (US 6,452,915).

        Regarding claim 8, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of claim

7.

        Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the packetizing module

attaches a real time protocol header to each packet.

        Jorgensen teaches a packetizing module attaches a real time protocol

header to each packet (Col. 41, lines 48-61).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to have a

packetizing module which attaches a real time protocol header to each packet so

to enable the packets to be delivered to many destinations with little or no delay.

        Regarding claim 12, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of

claim 7.

        Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the packetization module

packetizes the signal according to a real-time protocol.

        Jorgensen teaches a packetization module packetizes the signal

according to a real-time protocol (Col. 41, lines 48-61).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to have a

packetizing module which attaches a real time protocol header to each packet so to enable the packets to be delivered to many destinations with little to no delay.

Regarding claim 13, Kassatly in view of Stifle and further in view of Jorgensen (Col. 41, lines 48-61) teaches the real-time protocol is RTP.

9.   Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kassatly in view of Stifle and further in view of Morioka (US 5,317,412).

Regarding claim 9, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of claim 7.

Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the multimedia data signal is raw data from a charged coupled device.

Morioka teaches a multimedia data signal that is raw data, i.e. Red, Green, and Blue color signals, from a charged coupled device, i.e. CCD video camera (Col. 4, lines 27-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to have a multimedia data signal that is raw data from a charged coupled device. This is beneficial because a charged coupled device camera can provide high definition video (Morioka-Col. 4, lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 10, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of
claim 7.

Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the capture module
formats the multimedia data signal into a standard YUV format.

Morioka teaches a capture module formats the multimedia data signal into
a standard YUV format, i.e. RGB to YUV conversion circuit (Col. 4, lines 27-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to have a
capture module that formats the multimedia data signal into a standard YUV
format. This is beneficial because YUV formatting enables a smaller bandwidth
by discarding some of the information.

10.   Claims 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Kassatly in view of Stifle and further in view of Takase (US
5,461,626).

Regarding claim 15, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of
claim 14.

Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches the multimedia device packetizes the
multimedia signal wherein the header information of each packet includes a
source identifier, i.e. subscriber address, and an order identifier, i.e. packet
number (Col. 9, lines 45-58).

Kassatly in view of Stifle does not clearly teach the header information of

each packet only includes a source identifier and an order identifier.

Takase teaches header information of each packet only includes a source

identifier, i.e. line number, and an order identifier, i.e. sequence number (Fig. 8;

Col. 3, lines 5-15; Col. 4, lines 60-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle to have the

header information of each packet only include a source identifier and an order

identifier, as taught by Takase, so to enable the packet header to remain free of

unnecessary fields.

Regarding claim 17, Kassatly (Col. 14, lines 5-7) in view of Stifle in view of

Takase teaches the set-top box, i.e. Selector-Receiver receives an interrupt from

the multimedia device, i.e. Scanner-Transmitter prior to receiving the multimedia

signal.

Regarding claim 18, Kassatly (Col. 10, lines 49-60; Fig. 1, el. 12; Fig. 3,

204) in view of Stifle in view of Takase teaches the set-top box does not add

header information prior to sending the multimedia signal.

11.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kassatly

in view of Stifle in view of Takase and further in view of Tompkins.

Regarding claim 16, Kassatly in view of Stifle teaches all elements of claim 14.

Kassatly in view of Stifle in view of Takase teaches all elements of claim 15.

Kassatly in view of Stifle in view of Takase does not clearly teach the multimedia device further includes an action identifier for indicating an interactive session type.

Tompkins teaches an action identifier for indicating an interactive session type, i.e. System ID (Col. 41, lines 39-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kassatly in view of Stifle in view of Takase to have an action identifier for indicating an interactive session type in the multimedia device so to enable the identification of a publication in a paperless network (Kassatly-Col. 29, lines 30-38).

12.   Claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stifle in view of Kassatly.

Regarding claim 19, Stifle teaches a system for multimedia transmission of data in a cable television network, the system (Col. 4, lines 25-30) comprising:

a set-top box, i.e. subscriber decoder unit (Fig. 1, el. 110), having a data port, (Fig. 3, el. 118), and a two-way communication cable port (Fig. 3, el. 105);

a multimedia device for providing to the data port of the set-top box a data

signal, i.e. subscriber terminal (Col. 8, lines 22-28; Fig. 1, el. 115, 120);

a headend operably coupled to the cable port of the set-top box for

receiving, processing, and forwarding to a destination at least the data contained

within data signal (Col. 8, lines 17-28).

Stifle does not clearly teach a multimedia device for providing a

compressed packetized multimedia data signal to a set-top box; and a headend

operably coupled to the set-top box for receiving, processing, and forwarding to a

destination at least the multimedia data contained within compressed packetized

multimedia data signal.

Kassatly teaches a multimedia device for providing a compressed

packetized multimedia data signal to a set-top box (Fig. 8, el. 216, 218, 220; Col.

13, lines 58-68; Col. 10, lines 54-58); and

a device, i.e. central switching system, operably coupled to the set-top box

for receiving, processing, and forwarding to a destination at least the multimedia

data contained within the compressed packetized multimedia data signal (Col.

15, line 35-Col. 16, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Stifle's multimedia device to be able to

transmit compressed packetized multimedia data signals to a set-top box, as

taught by Kassatly, and to have Stifle's headend operably coupled to the set-top

box for receiving, processing, and forwarding to a destination at least the

multimedia data contained within the compressed packetized multimedia data
signal, as in Kassatly's Central Switching system, so to enable the use of an
existing CATV network instead of implementing a new network which could be
costly.

Regarding claim 20, Stifle (Col. 10, lines 54-61) in view of Kassatly
teaches based upon an input signal to the set-top box an interactive session is
effectuated between the set-top box and the headend, i.e. sending packets
based on key depression.

Regarding claim 21, Stifle in view of Kassatly (Col. 14, lines 5-7; Col. 15,
lines 35-42) teaches the interactive session may be video conferencing.

Regarding claim 22, Stifle in view of Kassatly teaches the headend
receives destination multimedia data in a signal from the destination, the
headend directs the destination multimedia data to the set-top box, (Stifle-Col.
15, lines 45-52), wherein the destination multimedia data is decompressed and
provided to a television for display (Kassatly-Fig. 8, el. 202, 250).

Regarding claim 23, Stifle in view of Kassatly teaches the multimedia
device packetizes the multimedia data signal, (Kassatly-Col.10, lines 54-59), with

a header containing a set-top box identifier and packet order identifier (Stifle-Col. 9, lines 45-53).

Regarding claim 24, Stifle (Col. 8, lines 52-68; Col. 15, lines 45-52) in view of Kassatly teaches the destination multimedia data is sent to the set-top box based upon the set-top box identifier in the multimedia data signal.

13.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stifle in view of Kassatly and further in view of Tompkins.

Regarding claim 25, Stifle in view of Kassatly teaches all elements of claim 23.

Stifle in view of Kassatly teaches the headend receives data for the compressed packetized multimedia data signal originating at the set-top box (Kassatly-Fig. 8, el. 216, 218, 220; Col. 13, lines 58-68; Col. 10, lines 54-58), (Stifle-Col. 8, lines 22-29).

Stifle in view of Kassatly does not clearly teach a destination address.

Tompkins teaches a terminal transmits a message that contains the destination address of the receiving terminal, i.e. message header that contains the source ID of the sender and destination ID for the receiving terminal (Col. 41, lines 40-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stifle in view of Kassatly packet

header to have a destination ID, as taught by Tompkins, so to help ensure delivery of a data packet to the correct receiving terminal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEREMY DUFFIELD whose telephone number is (571)270-1643. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 7:30 A.M.-5:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hai Tran can be reached on (571) 272-7305. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

6 December 2007
JSD

/Hai Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4178